



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

While grotesque opinions like these and the entirely reactionary temper of the author mar this work, they do not entirely destroy its value; there is enough correct information and sane opinion left to give the book a respectable position among serious treatises. Some of the chapters, such as that on the empire and the press are highly interesting. The main thesis of the author is that the disfranchisement of colonial citizens in matters of imperial concern must cease. He briefly reviews the various schemes of imperial federation that have been suggested, and finally develops a plan for an imperial senate of 216 members, elected by the legislatures of the component parts of the empire. The British cabinet is also to act as the ministry in this senate. Imperial questions must first be submitted to this body, but its powers are advisory only; before going into effect laws passed by it must receive the consent of the legislature or legislatures concerned. The author claims for this plan the advantage that it would not necessitate a radical modification of the parliamentary system as now established.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

Administrative Problems of British India. By JOSEPH CHAILLEY, translated by SIR WILLIAM MEYER. (London: Macmillan and Company, 1910. Pp. xv, 590.)

The book before us is a translation of M. Chailley's "*L'Inde Britannique*." The title chosen by the English translator is too narrow, as the book really deals with the conditions of Indian life and the methods of British government in India, and only incidentally with administrative problems. The book therefore offers far more than we are led to expect from its title, in fact it gives a complete survey, though summary in part, of religious, social, economic, and political conditions in India, including also such topics as caste, codes of law, and education.

The work of M. Chailley is quite unlike the books ordinarily produced by Frenchmen writing about India, in that he looks upon British rule and its methods with a great amount of sympathy. He is a close student of British colonial methods, and in the preparation of this work he enjoyed the coöperation and assistance of Sir William Meyer, his translator, as well as of other British officials. The Indian press has criticised his work as being unduly favorable to British rule,

as in fact being almost official in its opinion and view, and proportionately unappreciative of Indian character and aspirations. The sound qualities of the treatise will however be generally acknowledged; it is a clear, fair, and exceedingly interesting presentation of the state of contemporary India.

It would be useless to attempt in this place anything like a summary of the work; suffice it to indicate a few characteristics and conclusions. The author notices the deep social cleft between the British officials and native society. The former live entirely by themselves without seeking contact with the native life about them; unlike the earlier governors of India, they have as a rule no personal relations with its people. In speaking of Indian society the author uncovers many difficulties: the common people are wasteful, improvident and lazy; large expenditures for unnecessary festivities and ceremonies deliver them into the power of the money lenders. It is possible that on this point the author's judgment has been somewhat too much influenced by the official view, leading him to exaggerate defects which undoubtedly exist. The class of active politicians he finds selfish in their aims, and out of touch with the people. The wealthier class, the politicians, and the multitude, have little understanding for or sympathy with each other. In this matter also, there is room for difference of opinion; the events of the last five or six years have brought about a deep political movement which extends down through all the layers of society and is bringing about a feeling of common interest among the Indian people.

The vexed question of the more general admission of native Indians to higher office the author deals with in a sense favorable to such a policy. He recognizes however the insufficiency of literary examinations and approves the English insistence upon character rather than mere intellectual gifts. He also favors the further extension of the system by which the various interests of the community are represented in the legislative councils. In order to leaven the intellect of India it seems to him desirable that a large number of young men should be sent to European and American institutions of learning, at the expense of the government. The author does not contribute anything new to the study of the economic situation in India; he himself declares that it is impossible to arrive at a connected view upon this matter on account of the inadequacy of existing statistics. He, however, gives it as his opinion that the rate and amount of the

land tax have not really been increased; and also that seventy-five percent of the lands have come into the hands of money lenders.

Considered as a whole the book is one of the most accurate, fair, and readable treatises that have appeared upon Indian affairs; it affords an admirable introduction to the subject for students and is full of suggestive thought.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

The Roman Empire: Essays on the Constitutional History from Domitian (81 A. D.) to the Retirement of Nicephorus III, (1081 A. D.) By F. W. BUSSELL. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1910. 2 vols. Pp. xiv, 402; xxiii, 521.)

The title of this work should not lead one to suppose that it is, in any proper sense, a constitutional history of the Roman Empire. Those persons who have a lingering fondness for the so-called "philosophy of history," with little taste for the critical examination of historical facts, will no doubt, find some satisfaction in perusing these pages. The author makes no claim to supersede the histories of Gibbon, Finlay, Bury, and Hodgkin; but he hopes to find in his peculiar method of treatment some justification for his own work. Although he claims to have come into relation with such critical historians as Freeman and Pelham, there is little in his volumes to suggest the methods pursued by these Oxford professors. On the contrary, the author seems to have fallen, at some time of life, under the more idealistic influence of Fichte and Hegel; and continues to look upon history, if not as the embodiment of abstract truth, at least as furnishing suitable texts for philosophical homilies. In his introduction, it is true, he professes not to "believe that vague and *a priori* generalities of an age can form a substitute for genuine acquaintance"; yet he presents himself as an apologist for what he is pleased to call "the subjective treatment of history," and claims that one may learn more from one page of Hegel's "audacious generalities, his subsuming of events coercively under his preconceived categories, than from the dry recital of the most severely conscientious historians." In his treatment of the subject before him he claims to assume "the rôle of the philosophical onlooker," whose "subjective appreciation of a period" will not be interrupted by the "leaden sediment of footnotes."